

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-32, 34-40, 42-45, 47-50, 54-56, 58-60, 62-64, 66-68, 70-72, and 74-76 are pending in this application. Independent Claims 1, 13 and 25 are amended by the present amendment. Support for the amended claims can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings.<sup>1</sup> No new matter is presented.

In the Final Office Action of November 16, 2006 (herein “the Final Action”), Claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-32, 34-40, 42-45, 47-50, 54-56, 58-60, 62-64, 66-68, 70-72 and 74-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delano (U.S. Publication No. 006430558B1) in view of Busey et al (U.S. Publication No. 006377944B1, hereinafter “Busey”) and further in view of Kalpio et al. (U.S. Publication No. 006343323B1, hereinafter “Kalpio”).

In response to the above noted rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1, 13 and 25 and independent Claims 37, 42 and 47 recite novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a method for managing documents, comprising the step of:

receiving a request from a remote user...  
selecting an application service provider from a  
plurality of application service providers based on said request,  
wherein ***said request is not related to said application service  
provider...***

Independent Claims 13 and 25, while directed to alternative embodiments, are amended to recite similar features. Accordingly, the remarks presented below are applicable to each of independent Claims 1, 13 and 25.

---

<sup>1</sup> e.g., specification, p. 7.

As discussed in an exemplary embodiment at p. 7 of the specification, the document manager 60 includes a search engine configured to search and access application service providers (ASPs) based on a user request. The user need only input information related to the documents required and not related to the ASP from which desired document is to be retrieved.

In addressing the claimed features directed to interacting with an ASP and providing a user with consulting device, the Final Official Action cites Delano. Specifically, the Final Official Action cites the “searching” embodiment described at col. 5, line 55-col. 6, line 49 of Delano.

Delano, however, fails to teach or suggest “selecting an application service provider from a plurality of application service providers based on said request, wherein *said request is not related to said application service provider,*” as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

Instead, the cited portion of Delano describes that a search begins with the submission and acceptance of a search topic or criteria from the Searcher entity (32). This search topic consists of any information by which the content in the knowledge base (25) has been indexed, and is typically a text search string with additional text or category filters that may restrict the search to a particular sub-domain of the index. Delano then describes that the next step is to use a Ranked Topic and Content Index or Browse and Search Index (21) to determine an appropriate information source (e.g., database).

Therefore, Delano not only describes that the search topic or criteria is related to a particular source (e.g., database) from which the appropriate content can be retrieved, but further describes that the source is determined based on the search criteria (e.g., request). Accordingly, Delano fails to teach or suggest “selecting an application service provider from

a plurality of application service providers based on said request, wherein ***said request is not related to said application service provider,***” as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

Further, Busey and Kalpio fail to remedy the above noted deficiency in Delano.

Busey describes a consumer interface that allows a customer to receive automated information but fails to teach or suggest selecting an ASP when the request is not related to the selected ASP. Furthermore, Kalpio fails to teach or suggest the above noted claimed feature.

Since Delano, Busey, and/or Kalpio, either when taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in independent Claims 1, 13 and 25, Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established with respect to these claims. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of Claims 1, 13 and 25.

Independent Claim 37 recites, *inter alia*, a method for managing documents, comprising the step of:

receiving a request from a remote user;  
***receiving a document and storage information from  
said user...***  
***transmitting said document and at least part of said  
storage information to a storage device of said application  
service provider...***

Independent Claims 42 and 47, while directed to alternative embodiments, recite similar features. Accordingly, the remarks presented below are applicable to each of independent Claims 37, 42 and 47.

The Final Official Action appears to group independent Claims 37, 42 and 47 with the rejection of independent Claims 1, 13 and 25, but fails to address the above emphasized features of independent Claim 37.

As noted above, Delano is directed to searching knowledge databases and formatting the results of such searches. At no point does Delano teach or suggest receiving a document

and storage information from a user, and transmitting the document and at least a part of the storage information to a storage device of the application service provider, whatsoever.

Delano, instead, is directed to retrieving information from various databases or sources of information. Similarly, neither Busey nor Kalpio teach or suggest this claimed feature.

Accordingly, as none of the applied references teach or suggest the above noted features recited in independent Claims 37, 42 and 47, and the Final Official Action fails to acknowledge these features, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claims 37, 42 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

Further, dependent Claims 38, 43 and 48 recite receiving “said document and storage information after a storage time period associated with said document to be transmitted.”

In addressing this claimed feature, the Final Office Action relies on col. 2, line 63-col. 3, line 39; col. 4, lines 10-28; and col. 5, line 55-col. 6, line 25 of Delano. However, as discussed above, this cited portion of Delano simply describes a process for searching knowledge databases and fails to teach or suggest ***receiving said document and storage information after a storage time period associated with said document to be transmitted***, as recited in dependent Claims 38, 43 and 58.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claims 38, 43 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.


The dependent claims are considered allowable for the reasons advanced for the independent claims from which they depend. These claims are further considered allowable as they recite other features of the invention that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the applied references when those features are considered within the context of their respective independent claims.

Application No. 09/684,965  
With the Attached Request for Continued Examination

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-32, 34-40, 42-45, 47-50, 54-56, 58-60, 62-64, 66-68, 70-72, and 74-76, is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Andrew T. Harry  
Registration No. 56,959

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\19'S\197849US\197849US-AMDWRCE.DOC